



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/602,552	06/24/2003	Brian Gonsalves	1033-SS00392	1238
60533	7590	01/17/2007	EXAMINER	
TOLER SCHAFFER, LLP 5000 PLAZA ON THE LAKES SUITE 265 AUSTIN, TX 78746			DANIEL JR, WILLIE J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2617	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS	01/17/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/602,552	GONSALVES ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Willie J. Daniel, Jr.	2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 October 2006.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,3-12,18,19,21-29,32-39,42-46 and 50-52 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,3-12,18,19,21-29,32-39,42-46 and 50-52 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- Notice of Informal Patent Application
- Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to applicant's amendment filed on 30 October 2006. **Claims 1, 3-12, 18-19, 21-29, 32-39, 42-46, and 50-52** are now pending in the present application and **claims 2, 13-17, 20, 30-31, 40-41, and 43-49**. This office action is made **Final**.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on

- a. 25 July 2006

is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97 and is being considered by the examiner.

The IDS 1449 (see item a above) included reference documents that were not considered by the Examiner. The documents are the following:

- i. Documents US 2005/0273781 A1 and US 2006/0031587 A1 post-date the filing date of the instant application and are not considered prior art.
- ii. Document US 2001/0019955 is a duplicate document that was submitted in an IDS 1449 mailed on 11 January 2006 and has already been considered for the record.
- iii. Document US 2002/0119800 was previously considered by the Examiner and made of record in PTO-892 Paper No. 03.

Therefore, the documents listed in items i-v are lined through (or crossed-out) and have not been considered for the reasons as indicated in items i-iii above.

Claim Objections

3. **Claims 4 and 43-49** objected to because of the following informalities:
 - a. Claim 4 failed to properly mark-up (i.e., underlining) the newly added limitation “...wherein the wireless local area telephone comprises a second display...” in line(s) 2-3 of the claim. The Examiner interprets as though the Applicant intended to include this limitation in the amended claim.
 - b. Claims 43-49 are labeled as “...canceled...” on pg. 7 listing of claims. The Examiner interprets as --claims 47-49-- are the canceled claims.

See MPEP § 714 and 37 CFR 1.121(c). Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3-6, 9-12, 18-19, 21-23, 25-29, 32-35, 37-39, 42-45, and 50-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Uchiyama (US 6,766,175 B2)** in view of **Alexis (US 2004/0072544 A1)** and **Jaggers et al. (hereinafter Jaggers) (US 2002/0119800 A1)**.

Regarding **claim 1**, Uchiyama discloses a docking station (2) which reads on the claimed “apparatus” comprising:

an interface adapter/wireless cradle (8, 102) which reads on the claimed “wireless wide

area network telephone interface" (see col. 5, lines 14-20; col. 8, lines 64-67; col. 10, lines 25-28; Figs. 1-2, 5, 7);

a transceiver (116) to communicate with a cordless telephone (6) which reads on the claimed "wireless local area telephone" (see col. 6, lines 55-61; Figs. 1, 7); and a controller (128) which reads on the claimed "first control module" to transfer a call received at the wireless wide area network telephone interface (8) to the transceiver (6) (see col. 5, lines 38-50; col. 5, line 60 - col. 6, line 11; col. 10, lines 35-43; col. 12, lines 53-67; Figs. 1, 7, 9 "ref. 146");

a interface (8, 102) to communicate with a first type of external device (e.g., wireless telephone 4) (Figs. 1 and 7), where the docking station has an interface to connect with a wireless telephone; and

a cordless cradle (16, 122) which reads on the claimed "second data interface" of a second type to communicate with a cordless telephone (6) which reads on the claimed "second type of external device" (see col. 6, lines 46-51; col. 10, lines 1-3; Figs. 1-2, 5, 7), where the interface that connects the phone (e.g., cordless) with the docking station is able to transmit memory and caller ID data,

when a wireless telephone (4) which reads on the claimed "wireless wide area network telephone" is coupled to the wireless wide area network telephone interface (8) (see col. 5, lines 38-50; col. 5, line 60 - col. 6, line 11; col. 10, lines 35-43; col. 12, lines 53-67; Figs. 1, 7, and 9 "ref. 146"),

wherein the wireless wide area network telephone (4) comprises a first display (28) (see col. 7, line 14; Figs. 1, 3A, and 7), and

wherein information associated with the call is displayed on the first display (28) (see col. 11, lines 60-67; Figs. 1-2, 5, 7, 9, "ref. 148, 150"), where message (e.g., caller ID) of an incoming call from the wireless telephone (4). Uchiyama does not specifically disclose having the feature a universal serial bus (USB) interface to communicate with a first type of external device. However, the examiner maintains that the feature an interface to communicate with a first type of external device was well known in the art, as taught by Alexis.

As further support in the same field of endeavor, Alexis discloses the features an interface to communicate with a first type of external device (109) (see pg. 2, [0028]; pg. 2-3, [0031]; Figs. 1, 15, and 4), where the base unit (cradle 204) has interface circuitry (106) which connects to other devices (109, 110). Also, Alexis furthers supports the feature a second data interface of a second type to communicate with a second type of external device (110) (see pg. 2, [0028]; pg. 2-3, [0031]; Figs. 1, 15, and 4), where the interfaces of the base unit (204) are connectable to multiple communication devices (109, 110).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Uchiyama and Alexis to have the feature an interface to communicate with a first type of external device, in order for users to make wireless telephone calls from a conventional landline communication device via a connected interface circuitry, as taught by Alexis (see pg. 1, [0007, 0009]). The combination of Uchiyama and Alexis does not specifically disclose having the feature a universal serial bus (USB) interface to communicate with a first type of external device. However, the examiner

maintains that the feature a universal serial bus (USB) interface to communicate with a first type of external device was well known in the art, as taught by Jaggers.

In the same field of endeavor, Jaggers discloses the feature a universal serial bus (USB) interface to communicate with a first type of external device (see pg. 3, [0028]; pg. 2-3, [0027]; pg. 2, [0013]; Figs. 1A-D and 3).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Uchiyama, Alexis, and Jaggers to have the feature a universal serial bus (USB) interface to communicate with a first type of external device, in order to enhance existing wireless communication device capabilities and features available in a docking station, as taught by Jaggers (see pg. 1, [0011]).

Regarding **claim 3**, the combination of Uchiyama, Alexis, and Jaggers discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 1), in addition Uchiyama further discloses the apparatus (2) of claim 1, wherein the wireless local area telephone (6) comprises a cordless telephone handset (6) which reads on the claimed "wireless local area handset" (see col. 5, lines 38-40; Figs. 1, 4A).

Regarding **claim 4**, the combination of Uchiyama, Alexis, and Jaggers discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 1), in addition Uchiyama further discloses the apparatus (2) of claim 1, wherein the wireless local area telephone comprises a second display (52) (see col. 7, line 60; Figs. 4A, 1, 7).

Regarding **claim 5**, the combination of Uchiyama, Alexis, and Jaggers discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 4), in addition Uchiyama further discloses the apparatus (2) of claim 4, wherein the wireless local area telephone (6)

comprises a cordless telephone (6) which reads on the claimed “desktop telephone” (see col. 5, lines 14-18; col. 2, lines 4-12; Figs. 4A, 1, 7), where the cordless telephone rests in and communicates with the docking station (2) in which the docking station would be located in a physical location such as wall mounted or desktop.

Regarding **claim 6**, the combination of Uchiyama, Alexis, and Jaggers discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 1), in addition Uchiyama further discloses the apparatus (2) of claim 1, wherein the transceiver (116) includes an antenna (114) assembly responsive to a 900 MHz transceiver which reads on the claimed “driver” (see col. 6, lines 55-61; Figs. 1, 5, 7 “ref. 118”).

Regarding **claim 9**, the combination of Uchiyama, Alexis, and Jaggers discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 1), in addition Uchiyama further discloses the apparatus (2) of claim 1 wherein the wireless wide area network telephone (4) is a wireless telephone (4) which reads on the claimed “PCS telephone” (see col. 5, lines 28-37; Figs. 1, 7).

Regarding **claim 10**, the combination of Uchiyama, Alexis, and Jaggers discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 1), in addition Uchiyama further discloses the apparatus (2) of claim 1, further comprising:

a speakerphone (22) which reads on the claimed “speaker” (see col. 8, lines 38-48; Fig. 5, 7);

a function key (74) which reads on the claimed “second control module” to communicate an incoming voice portion of the call received at the wireless wide area network telephone interface (8) to the speaker (22) (see col. 8, lines 38-48; col. 11, lines 13-25; Figs. 2, 5, 7).

Regarding **claim 11**, the combination of Uchiyama, Alexis, and Jaggers discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 1), in addition Uchiyama further discloses the apparatus (2) of claim 1, further comprising:

a speakerphone (22) which reads on the claimed “microphone” (see col. 8, lines 38-48; col. 11, lines 13-25; Figs. 2, 5, 7); and

the second control module (74) to provide an outgoing voice portion received at the microphone to the wireless wide area network interface (see col. 8, lines 38-48; col. 11, lines 13-25; Figs. 2, 5, 7).

Regarding **claim 12**, the combination of Uchiyama, Alexis, and Jaggers discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 11), in addition Uchiyama further discloses the apparatus (2) of claim 11, further comprising an alphanumeric keypad (18) (see col. 8, lines 26-37; col. 11, lines 13-18; Figs. 2, 5, 7).

Regarding **claim 18**, the combination of Uchiyama, Alexis, and Jaggers discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 1), in addition Uchiyama further discloses the apparatus (2) of claim 1, further comprising a power supply adapter (10, 106) which reads on the claimed “battery charger” for charging a battery in the wireless wide area network telephone (4) (see col. 6, lines 13-19; col. 10, lines 7-10; Figs. 1, 7).

Regarding **claim 19**, the combination of Uchiyama, Alexis, and Jaggers discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 1), in addition Uchiyama further discloses the apparatus (2) of claim 1, further comprising:

a battery charger (10) for charging a battery in the wireless wide area telephone (4) (see col. 6, lines 13-19; col. 10, lines 7-10; Figs. 1, 7); and

a battery charger (10) for charging a battery in the wireless local area telephone (6) (see col. 6, lines 13-19; col. 10, lines 7-10; Figs. 1, 7).

Regarding **claim 21**, Uchiyama discloses every limitation claimed as applied above in claim 1. Uchiyama does not specifically disclose having the feature wherein the first type of external device is a personal computer (PC). However, the examiner maintains that the feature wherein the first type of external device is a personal computer (PC) was well known in the art, as taught by Alexis.

Alexis further discloses the feature wherein the first type of external device is a computer systems (110) which reads on the claimed “personal computer (PC)” (see pg. 2, [0028]; pg. 3, [0031]; Figs. 1, 15, 4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Uchiyama, Alexis, and Jaggers to have the feature wherein the first type of external device is a personal computer (PC), in order for users to make wireless telephone calls from a conventional landline communication device via a connected interface circuitry, as taught by Alexis (see pg. 1, [0007, 0009]).

Regarding **claim 22**, Uchiyama discloses every limitation claimed as applied above in claim 1. Uchiyama does not specifically disclose having the feature wherein the first type of external device is a camera. However, the examiner maintains that the feature wherein the first type of external device is a camera was well known in the art, as taught by Alexis.

Alexis further discloses the feature wherein the first type of external device is a personal video recording devices (109, 110) which reads on the claimed “camera” (see pg. 2, [0028]; pg. 3, [0031]; Figs. 1, 15, 4).

As a note, Jaggers also further discloses the feature wherein the first type of external device is a camera (see pg. 3, [0028]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Uchiyama, Alexis, and Jaggers to have the feature wherein the first type of external device is a camera, in order for users to make wireless telephone calls from a conventional landline communication device via a connected interface circuitry, as taught by Alexis (see pg. 1, [0007, 0009]).

Regarding **claim 23**, Uchiyama discloses every limitation claimed as applied above in claim 1. Uchiyama does not specifically disclose having the feature wherein the first type of external device is a personal data assistant (PDA). However, the examiner maintains that the feature wherein the first type of external device is a personal data assistant (PDA) was well known in the art, as taught by Alexis.

Alexis further discloses the feature wherein the first type of external device is a personal data assistant (PDA) (108, 109, 110) (see pg. 2, [0028-0029]; pg. 3, [0031]; pg. 11, [0085]; Figs. 1, 15, 4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Uchiyama, Alexis, and Jaggers to have the feature wherein the first type of external device is a personal data assistant (PDA), in order for users to make wireless telephone calls from a conventional landline communication device via a connected interface circuitry, as taught by Alexis (see pg. 1, [0007, 0009]).

Regarding **claim 25**, the combination of Uchiyama and Alexis discloses every limitation claimed as applied above in claim 1. The combination of Uchiyama and Alexis

does not specifically disclose having the feature wherein the first data interface is a universal serial bus (USB) interface. However, the examiner maintains that the feature wherein the first data interface is a universal serial bus (USB) interface was well known in the art, as taught by Jaggers.

Jaggers further discloses the feature wherein the first data interface is a universal serial bus (USB) interface (see pg. 3, [0028]; pg. 2-3, [0027]; pg. 2, [0013]; Figs. 1A-D and 3).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Uchiyama, Alexis, and Jaggers to have the feature wherein the first data interface is a universal serial bus (USB) interface, in order to enhance existing wireless communication device capabilities and features available in a docking station, as taught by Jaggers (see pg. 1, [0011]).

Regarding **claim 26**, the combination of Uchiyama discloses every limitation claimed as applied above in claim 1. Uchiyama does not specifically disclose having the feature wherein the second data interface is a portable media reader and/or writer interface. However, the examiner maintains that the feature wherein the second data interface is a portable media reader and/or writer interface was well known in the art, as taught by Alexis.

Alexis further discloses the feature wherein the second data interface is a portable media reader and/or writer interface (see pg. 3, [0031]; pg. 2, [0028]; pg. 6, [0052]; pg. 5, [0046-0047]; pg. 1, [0009]; Figs. 1, 15, 4), where the interface circuitry (106, 204) is connected to communication devices (110, 109) such as computer systems or video recording devices in which the portable media reader and/or writer interface would be inherent to

record and/or store information as evidenced by the fact that one of ordinary skill in the art would clearly recognize.

As a note, Jaggers also further discloses the feature wherein the second data interface is a portable media reader and/or writer interface (see pg. 3, [0028]), where the docking station is coupled to I/O devices such as CD and floppy drives.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Uchiyama, Alexis, and Jaggers to have the feature wherein the second data interface is a portable media reader and/or writer interface, in order for users to make wireless telephone calls from a conventional landline communication device via a connected interface circuitry, as taught by Alexis (see pg. 1, [0007, 0009]).

Regarding **claim 27**, Uchiyama discloses a method comprising:

receiving an incoming call signal from a wireless wide area network telephone (4) at a docking station (2) which reads on the claimed “base station” (see col. 11, lines 53-60; col. 5, lines 46-50; Figs. 1, 7, 9); and

initiating communication from the base station (2) to a wireless local area telephone (6) in response to receiving the incoming call signal (see col. 11, lines 53-60; col. 5, lines 46-50; Figs. 1, 7, 9),

wherein information associated with the call is displayed at a display (52) of the wireless local area telephone when the wireless wide area network telephone (4) is docked at the base station (see col. 11, lines 33-37,60-67; Figs. 1-2, 5, 7, 9 “ref. 148, 150”), where message (e.g., caller ID) of an incoming call from the wireless telephone (4) is received at the docking

station (2) and the cordless telephone (6). Uchiyama does not specifically disclose having the feature communicating with an external device through a universal serial bus (USB) interface. However, the examiner maintains that the feature communicating with an external device through a interface was well known in the art, as taught by Alexis.

As further support in the same field of endeavor, Alexis discloses the feature communicating with an external device (109,110) through a interface (see pg. 2, [0028]; pg. 2-3, [0031]; Figs. 1, 15, and 4), where the base unit (cradle 204) has interface circuitry which connects to other devices (109, 110). Also, Alexis discloses of having interfaces of the cradle (204) being connected to multiple communication devices (109, 110) (see pg. 2, [0028]; pg. 2-3, [0031]; Figs. 1, 15, and 4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Uchiyama and Alexis to have the feature communicating with an external device through a interface, in order for users to make wireless telephone calls from a conventional landline communication device via a connected interface circuitry, as taught by Alexis (see pg. 1, [0007, 0009]). The combination of Uchiyama and Alexis does not specifically disclose having the feature communicating with an external device through a universal serial bus (USB) interface. However, the examiner maintains that the feature communicating with an external device through a universal serial bus (USB) interface was well known in the art, as taught by Jaggers.

In the same field of endeavor, Jaggers discloses the feature communicating with an external device through a universal serial bus (USB) interface (see pg. 3, [0028]; pg. 2-3, [0027]; pg. 2, [0013]; Figs. 1A-D and 3).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Uchiyama, Alexis, and Jaggers to have the feature communicating with an external device through a universal serial bus (USB) interface, in order to enhance existing wireless communication device capabilities and features available in a docking station, as taught by Jaggers (see pg. 1, [0011]).

Regarding **claim 28**, the combination of Uchiyama, Alexis, and Jaggers discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 27), in addition Uchiyama further discloses the method of claim 27, further comprising charging the wireless wide area network telephone (4) from the base station (2) (see col. 6, lines 13-19; col. 10, lines 7-10; Figs. 1, 7).

Regarding **claim 29**, the combination of Uchiyama, Alexis, and Jaggers discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 28), in addition Uchiyama further discloses the method of claim 28, further comprising charging the wireless local area telephone (6) from the base station (2) (see col. 6, lines 13-19; col. 10, lines 7-10; Figs. 1, 7).

Regarding **claim 32**, Uchiyama discloses every limitation claimed as applied above in claim 27. Uchiyama does not specifically disclose having the wherein the external device is a personal computer (PC). However, the examiner maintains that the feature wherein the external device is a personal computer (PC) was well known in the art, as taught by Alexis.

Alexis further discloses the feature wherein the external device is a computer systems (110) which reads on the claimed “personal computer (PC)” (see pg. 2, [0028]; pg. 3, [0031]; Figs. 1, 15, 4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Uchiyama, Alexis, and Jaggers to have

the feature wherein the external device is a personal computer (PC), in order for users to make wireless telephone calls from a conventional landline communication device via a connected interface circuitry, as taught by Alexis (see pg. 1, [0007, 0009]).

Regarding **claim 33**, Uchiyama discloses every limitation claimed as applied above in claim 27. Uchiyama does not specifically disclose having the feature wherein the external device is a camera. However, the examiner maintains that the feature wherein the external device is a camera was well known in the art, as taught by Alexis.

Alexis further discloses the feature wherein the external device is a personal video recording devices (109, 110) which reads on the claimed "camera" (see pg. 2, [0028]; pg. 3, [0031]; Figs. 1, 15, 4).

As a note, Jaggers also further discloses the feature wherein the first type of external device is a camera (see pg. 3, [0028]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Uchiyama, Alexis, and Jaggers to have the feature wherein the external device is a camera, in order for users to make wireless telephone calls from a conventional landline communication device via a connected interface circuitry, as taught by Alexis (see pg. 1, [0007, 0009]).

Regarding **claim 34**, the combination of Uchiyama, Alexis, and Jaggers discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 27), in addition Uchiyama further discloses the method of claim 27, further comprising communicating with an external device (6) through a second standardized interface (16, 122) (see col. 6, lines 46-51; col. 10, lines 1-3; Figs. 1-2, 5, 7). Also, Alexis furthers supports the feature communicating with an external

device (110) through second standardized interface (see pg. 2, [0028]; pg. 2-3, [0031]; Figs. 1, 15, and 4), where the interfaces of the base unit (204) are connectable to multiple communication devices (109, 110).

Regarding **claim 35**, Uchiyama discloses every limitation claimed as applied above in claim 34. Uchiyama does not specifically disclose having the feature wherein the second standardized interface is a portable media reader and/or writer interface. However, the examiner maintains that the feature wherein the second standardized interface is a portable media reader and/or writer interface was well known in the art, as taught by Alexis.

Alexis further discloses the feature wherein the second standardized interface is a portable media reader and/or writer interface (see pg. 3, [0031]; pg. 2, [0028]; pg. 6, [0052]; pg. 5, [0046-0047]; pg. 1, [0009]; Figs. 1, 15, 4), where the interface circuitry (106, 204) is connected to communication devices (109) in which the portable media reader and/or writer interface would be inherent.

As a note, Jaggers also further discloses the feature wherein the second data interface is a portable media reader and/or writer interface (see pg. 3, [0028]), where the docking station is coupled to I/O devices such as CD and floppy drives.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Uchiyama, Alexis, and Jaggers to have the feature wherein the second standardized interface is a portable media reader and/or writer interface, in order for users to make wireless telephone calls from a conventional landline communication device via a connected interface circuitry, as taught by Alexis (see pg. 1, [0007, 0009]).

Regarding **claim 37**, Uchiyama discloses a method comprising:

receiving an outgoing call request signal at a base station (2) from a wireless local area telephone (6) (see col. 12, lines 11-29; Fig. 10); and

initiating from the base station (2) a call to be made from a wireless wide area network telephone (4) in response to receiving the outgoing call request signal (see col. 12, lines 11-29; Fig. 10); and

displaying information associated with the call a display (28) of the wireless wide area network telephone (4) when the wireless wide area network telephone (4) is coupled to the base station (see col. 11, lines 60-67; Figs. 1-2, 5, 7, 9, “ref. 148, 150”), where message (e.g., caller ID) of an incoming call from the wireless telephone (4). Uchiyama does not specifically disclose having the feature communicating with an external device through a universal serial bus (USB) interface. However, the examiner maintains that the feature communicating with an external device through a interface was well known in the art, as taught by Alexis.

As further support in the same field of endeavor, Alexis discloses the feature communicating with an external device (109,110) through a interface (see pg. 2, [0028]; pg. 2-3, [0031]; Figs. 1, 15, and 4), where the base unit (cradle 204) has interface circuitry (106) which connects to other devices (109, 110). Also, Alexis discloses of having interfaces of the cradle (204) being connected to multiple communication devices (109, 110) (see pg. 2, [0028]; pg. 2-3, [0031]; Figs. 1, 15, and 4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Uchiyama and Alexis to have the feature

communicating with an external device through a interface, in order for users to make wireless telephone calls from a conventional landline communication device via a connected interface circuitry, as taught by Alexis (see pg. 1, [0007, 0009]). The combination of Uchiyama and Alexis does not specifically disclose having the feature communicating with an external device through a universal serial bus (USB) interface. However, the examiner maintains that the feature communicating with an external device through a universal serial bus (USB) interface was well known in the art, as taught by Jaggers.

In the same field of endeavor, Jaggers discloses the feature communicating with an external device through a universal serial bus (USB) interface (see pg. 3, [0028]; pg. 2-3, [0027]; pg. 2, [0013]; Figs. 1A-D and 3).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Uchiyama, Alexis, and Jaggers to have the feature communicating with an external device through a universal serial bus (USB) interface, in order to enhance existing wireless communication device capabilities and features available in a docking station, as taught by Jaggers (see pg. 1, [0011]).

Regarding **claims 38-39, and 42-45**, the claims are rejected for the same reasons as set forth above (see claims 28, 29, and 32-35 respectively).

Regarding **claim 50**, the combination of Uchiyama, Alexis, and Jaggers discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 4), in addition Uchiyama further discloses the apparatus (2) of claim 4, further comprising an alphanumeric keypad (18), wherein at least one of the first display (28) and the second display (52) is responsive to the

alphanumeric keypad (18) (see col. 6, lines 51-55; col. 8, lines 26-37; col. 11, lines 13-18; Figs. 1-5, 7, and 10).

Regarding **claim 51**, the combination of Uchiyama, Alexis, and Jaggers discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 4), in addition Uchiyama further discloses the apparatus (2) of claim 4, wherein at least one of the first display and the second display is responsive to text messages from the wireless wide area network telephone (4) (see col. 11, lines 33-37,60-67; Figs. 1-2, 5, 7, 9 “ref. 148, 150”), where alphanumeric or text message (e.g., caller ID) of an incoming call from the wireless telephone (4) is received at the docking station (2) and the cordless telephone (6). In addition, Alexis also further discloses the feature wherein at least one of the first display and the second display is responsive to text messages from the wireless wide area network telephone (102) (see pg. 9, [0072, lines 34-41]; pg. 10, [0077, 0079]; Figs. 1 and 4), where the system uses caller ID (CID) protocol for sending information such as email, text, and messages which is displayed.

Regarding **claim 52**, Uchiyama discloses the apparatus of claim 4, wherein at least one of the first display (28) and the second display (52) is a liquid crystal display (LCD) (see col. 7, line 14, 60; Figs. 1, 3A, 4A, and 7). Uchiyama does not specifically disclose having the feature display capable of displaying video images received from a wireless wide area network. However, the examiner maintains that the feature display capable of displaying video images received from a wireless wide area network was well known in the art, as taught by Alexis.

Alexis further discloses the feature display capable of displaying video images received from a wireless wide area network (see pg. 10, [0078-0079]; pg. 1, [0009]; pg. 2, [0028-0029]; pg. 5, [0046]; Figs. 1, 4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Uchiyama, Alexis, and Jaggers to have the feature display capable of displaying video images received from a wireless wide area network, in order for users to make wireless telephone calls from a conventional landline communication device via a connected interface circuitry, as taught by Alexis (see pg. 1, [0007, 0009]).

Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Uchiyama (US 6,766,175 B2)** in view of **Alexis (US 2004/0072544 A1)** and **Jaggers et al. (hereinafter Jaggers) (US 2002/0119800 A1)** as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of well known prior art (**MPEP 2144.03**).

Regarding **claim 7**, the combination of Uchiyama, Alexis, and Jaggers discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above, (see claim 6), in addition Uchiyama further discloses wherein the driver is to communicate with the wireless local area telephone (6) (see col. 6, lines 55-61; Figs. 1, 5, 7), where cordless telephone (6) communicates with the docking station (2) via a 900 MHz transceiver. The combination of Uchiyama, Alexis, and Jaggers does not specifically disclose having the feature at approximately 2.4 GHz. However, the examiner takes official notice of the fact that it was well known in the art to have the feature at approximately 2.4 GHz.

As a note, one of ordinary skill in the art would clearly recognize that the feature at approximately 2.4 GHz is common knowledge. For example, Uchiyama further teaches a 900 MHz transceiver is employed, however, any suitable frequency of operation may be used (see col. 6, lines 55-61).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Uchiyama, Alexis, and Jaggers by specifically having the feature at approximately 2.4 GHz, for the purpose of communicating between the docking station and the cordless telephone.

Regarding **claim 8**, the combination of Uchiyama, Alexis, and Jaggers discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above, (see claim 6), in addition Uchiyama further discloses wherein the driver is to communicate with the wireless local area telephone (6) (see col. 6, lines 55-61; Figs. 1, 5, 7), where cordless telephone (6) communicates with the docking station (2) via a 900 MHz transceiver. The combination of Uchiyama, Alexis, and Jaggers does not specifically disclose having the feature at approximately 5.8 GHz. However, the examiner takes official notice of the fact that it was well known in the art to have the feature at approximately 5.8 GHz.

As a note, one of ordinary skill in the art would clearly recognize that the feature at approximately 5.8 GHz is common knowledge. For example, Uchiyama further teaches a 900 MHz transceiver is employed, however, any suitable frequency of operation may be used (see col. 6, lines 55-61).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Uchiyama, Alexis, and Jaggers by specifically having the

feature at approximately 5.8 GHz, for the purpose of communicating between the docking station and the cordless telephone.

Claims 24, 36, and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Uchiyama (US 6,766,175 B2)** in view of **Alexis (US 2004/0072544 A1)** and **Jaggers et al. (hereinafter Jaggers) (US 2002/0119800 A1)** as applied to claim 1, 34, and 44 above, and further in view of **Harrison et al. (hereinafter Harrison) (US 2002/011190 A1)**.

Regarding **claim 24**, the combination of Uchiyama, Alexis, and Jaggers discloses every limitation claimed as applied above in claim 1. The combination of Uchiyama, Alexis, and Jaggers does not specifically disclose having the feature wherein the first type of external device is a digital storage card. However, the examiner maintains that the feature wherein the first type of external device is a digital storage card was well known in the art, as taught by Harrison.

In the same field of endeavor, Harrison discloses the feature wherein the first type of external device is a memory flash card (39) which reads on the claimed “digital storage card” (see pg. 3, [0044]; pg. 1, [0015]; Fig. 2a).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Uchiyama, Alexis, Jaggers, and Harrison to have the feature wherein the first type of external device is a digital storage card, in order to have a base station to back up data for a portable device, as taught by Harrison (see pg. 1, [0012, 0015]).

Regarding **claim 36**, the combination of Uchiyama, Alexis, and Jaggers discloses every limitation claimed as applied above in claim 34. The combination of Uchiyama, Alexis, and Jaggers does not specifically disclose having the feature wherein the external device is a digital storage card. However, the examiner maintains that the feature wherein the external device is a digital storage card was well known in the art, as taught by Harrison.

Harrison further discloses the feature wherein the external device is a memory flash card (39) which reads on the claimed “digital storage card” (see pg. 3, [0044]; pg. 1, [0015]; Fig. 2a).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Uchiyama, Alexis, Jaggers, and Harrison to have the feature wherein the external device is a digital storage card, in order to have a base station to back up data for a portable device, as taught by Harrison (see pg. 1, [0012, 0015]).

Regarding **claim 46**, the claim as applied to claim 44 is rejected for the same reasons as set forth above (see claim 36).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3-12, 18-19, 21-29, 32-39, 42-46, and 50-52 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection necessitated by the new limitations and claims.

In response to applicant's arguments, the Examiner respectfully disagrees as the applied reference(s) provide more than adequate support and to further clarify (see the above claims for relevant citations).

6. Applicant amended the claim language but failed to provide support (i.e., page(s), line(s), and drawing(s)) for the newly amended claim language. The Examiner requests applicant to provide support for the response filed 30 October 2006 and any further amended claim language.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2617

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Willie J. Daniel, Jr. whose telephone number is (571) 272-7907. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marsha D. Banks-Harold can be reached on (571) 272-7905 or Charles Appiah can be reached on (571) 272-7904. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/WJD,JR/

WJD,JR
09 January 2007


ERIKA S. GARY
PRIMARY EXAMINER